W2006 01681-WA-R3-WD IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF TENNESSEE AT MEMPHIS 1 THE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT 2 3 ORIGINAL STATE OF TENNESSEE 4 5 Case No. 05-03038 6 vs. VERN BRASWELL, 7 Defendant. 8 9 TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE 10 Volumes 11 OF 11 volumes 11 DECEMBER 5, 2005 12 13 THE HONORABLE JOSEPH B. DAILEY, PRESIDING JUDGE 14 15 APPEARANCES FOR THE STATE: 16 BETSY CARNESALE AND AMY WEIRICH 17 Assistant District Attorneys General District Attorney General's Office 18 201 Poplar Avenue - Third Floor Memphis, TN 38103 19 FOR THE DEFENDANT: 20 J. BAILEY AND WALTER BAILEY 21 Attorneys at Law 100 North Main - Suite 3002 22 Memphis, TN 38103 23 24 Reported by: Katherine Knowles 25 Court Reporter NOV 0 2 2005

Clerk of the Courte

	¢ ¥	
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	VOLUME ONE	
3		PAGE
4	Appearances	1
5	Table of Contents	2
6	List of Exhibits	9
7	Style and Caption	13
8	Monday, December 5, 2005	
9	Pre-trial Motions	14
10	Voir Dire Examination and Jury Selection	25
11	(VOLUME TWO)	
12	Tuesday, December 6, 2005	
13	VERN BRASWELL	
14	Voir Dire Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	185
15	Jury Sworn	187
16	Reading of Indictment and Entry of Plea	187
17	Opening Statements (By Ms. Weirich)	187
18	Opening Statements (By Mr. W. Bailey)	192
19	STATE'S PROOF	
20	PEARLINE WASHBURN	
21	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	199
22	ANGELA SNYDER	
23	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	227
24	JESSICA GREEN	
25	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	236

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	VOLUME ONE	
3		PAGE
4	ROOSEVELT COLEMAN	
5	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	243 247
6	Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	21/
7	LIEUTENANT JACKSON	
8	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	250 264
9	Redirect Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	270
10	BABA TANZY	
11	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	271 283
12	Cross-Examinación (by Mr. W. Dairey)	203
13	MATT HAMM	
14	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	285 293
15	Redirect Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	295
16	OFFICER GALLOWAY	
17	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	296 308
18	Cropp Hammington (by Fir. b. barrey)	300
19	SERGEANT KJELLIN	
20	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	313 323
21	Redirect Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	328
22	SERGEANT MERRITT	
23	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	328
24		
25		

		1
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	VOLUME ONE	
_	VOLIGHE ONE	PAGE
3		PAGE
4	LIEUTENANT MILLER	
5 6	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey) Redirect Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	362 368 369
7	(VOLUME THREE)	
8	Wednesday, December 7, 2005	
9	DARRELL BURTON	
10	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	384 389
11	Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	369
12	JERRY BROWN	
13	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	390 395
14	Closs-Examinación (by Mr. 5. Barrey)	
15	BENJANETTE STURDEVANT	
16	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	396 403
17	Closs Examinación (by n. c. barro,	
18	LIEUTENANT MITCHELL	
19	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	407 414
20	Closs Examination (by i.i. o. barrey)	
21	Jury-Out Hearing	419
22	OFFICER FAIR	
23	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	424 432
24	Redirect Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	434
25		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	VOLUME ONE	
3		PAGE
4	CAROLYN CHAMBERS	
5	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	435
6	OFFICER WALLS	
7	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	444
8	Jury-Out Hearing	
9	OFFICER WALLS	
10	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	448 450
11	Cross-Examinación (by Mr. U. Barrey)	450
12	OFFICER WALLS	
13	Direct Examination Continued (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	451 455
14	WILLIAM MANGUM Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	457
15	Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey) Redirect Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	468 475
16	Recross Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	476
17		
18	DOCTOR CARTER	
19	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	478
20	Redirect Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	518 542
21	(VOLUME FOUR)	
22	Thursday, December 8, 2005	
23	KRISTIE WOODS	
24	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	563
25	Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey) Redirect Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	618 629

1		1
-	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
1		
2	<u>VOLUME ONE</u>	
3		PAGE
4	Jury-Out Hearing	
5	VERA COLE	
6	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	633 637
7	Closs-Examination (by Mr. W. Barrey)	
8	MAGRA HARDEN	
9	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	640 645
10	Closs-Examination (by Mr. W. Balley)	0.10
11	Court's Ruling	653
12	KRISTIE WOODS	
13	Redirect Examination Continued (By Ms. Weirich) Recross Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	658 660
14	Further Redirect Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	662
15	SHERONDA SMITH	
16	Direct Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	667 678
17	Cross-Examinación (By Mr. U. Barrey)	0,70
18	VERA COLE	
19	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	682 690
20	Redirect Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Recross Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey)	693 695
21	Recross Examination (by Mr. U. Barrey)	0,73
22	MAGRA HARDEN	
23	Direct Examination (By Ms. Weirich) Cross-Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	698 703
24	Closs-Examinacton (by Mr. W. Barrey)	, 03
25	Motion for Judgment of Acquittal	706

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	VOLUME ONE	
3		PAGE
4	State Rests	709
5	(VOLUME FIVE)	
6	DEFENSE'S PROOF	
7	GLEN WRIGHT	
8	Direct Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey) Cross-Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	722 729
9	Cross-Examinación (by Ms. Weilich)	123
10	VERN BRASWELL	
11	Direct Examination (By Mr. J. Bailey) Cross-Examination (By Ms. Weirich)	730 788
12	Cross-Examinación (by Ms. Wellich)	700
13	DOCTOR SCHWARTZ	
14	Direct Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	816
15	Jury-Out Hearing	
16	DOCTOR SCHWARTZ	
17	Direct Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	826 827
18	Cross-Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Redirect Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey)	829
19	Court's Ruling	835
20	DOCTOR SCHWARTZ	
21	Direct Examination Continued (By Mr. W. Bailey)	838
22	Jury-Out Hearing	843
23	DOCTOR SCHWARTZ	
24	Direct Examination Continued (By Mr. W. Bailey)	846 847
25	Cross-Examination (By Ms. Carnesale) Redirect Examination (By Mr. W. Bailey) Recross Examination (By Ms. Carnesale)	858 858

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	VOLUME ONE	
3		PAGE
4	(VOLUME SIX)	
5	Friday, December 9, 2005	
6	Motion for Judgment of Acquittal	872
7	Jury Charge Discussion	872
8	Defense Rests	873
9	Closing Arguments (By Ms. Carnesale)	873
10	Closing Arguments (By Mr. W. Bailey)	884
11	Closing Arguments (By Ms. Weirich)	899
12	Jury Charge	926
13	Alternates Excused	941
14	Jury Questions	942
15	Verdict	945
16		
17	Certificate of Reporter	948
18		
19	20	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1			INDEX OF EXHI	BITS	
2					
3	NO.	STATE/DEFENSE	ID/EVIDENCE	TO/DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4	1	State	Evidence	P. Washburn, photo	202
5	2	State	Evidence	P. Washburn, photo	207
6	3	State	ID	P. Washburn, photos	312
7	3	State	Evidence	Officer Walls, photos	452
8	4	State	Evidence	P. Washburn,	217
9				check and letter	
10	5	State	Evidence	P. Washburn, money	218
11	6	State	ID	P. Washburn, note	218
12	6	State	Evidence	K. Woods, note	617
13	7	State	ID	P. Washburn, document	219
14	7	State	Evidence	W. Mangum, document	467
15	8	State	ID	P. Washburn, document	219
16	8	State	Evidence	W. Mangum, document	466
17	9	State	ID	P. Washburn, document	219
18	9	State	ID	W. Mangum, document	466
19	10	State	Evidence	A. Snyder, photo	235
20	11	State	Evidence	J. Green, tape	241
21	12	State	Evidence	R. Coleman, report	245
22	13	State	Evidence	Lt. Jackson, sketch	259
23	14	State	Evidence	B. Tanzy, photo	278
24	15	State	Evidence	B. Tanzy, photo	279
25					

Ī					1
1			INDEX OF EXH	IBITS	
2					
3	NO.	STATE/DEFENSE	ID/EVIDENCE	TO/DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4	16	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	298
5				crime scene sketch	
6	17	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
7	100			photo	
8	18	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
9				photo	
10	19	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
11				photo	
12	20	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
13				photo	
14	21	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
15				photo	
16	22	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
17				photo	
18	23	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
19				photo	
20	24	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	304
21				photo	
22	25	State	Evidence	Officer Galloway,	308
23				two bottles	
24	26	State	Evidence	Sgt. Merritt,	335
25				Advice of Rights for	rm

1			INDEX OF EXHI	BITS	
2					
3	NO.	STATE/DEFENSE	ID/EVIDENCE	TO/DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4	27	State	Evidence	Sgt. Merritt, CD	358
5	28	State	Evidence	Lt. Miller, statement	365
6	29	State	Evidence	J. Brown, phone record	391
7	30	State	Evidence	B. Sturdevant,	397
8				phone records	
9	31	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	483
10	32	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	485
11	33	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photos	489
12	34	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photos	489
13	35	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	491
14	36	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, necklace	492
15	37	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	495
16	38	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	497
17	39	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	498
18	40	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	499
19	41	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	503
20	42	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	504
21	43	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	511
22	44	State	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	513
23	45	Defense	Evidence	Dr. Carter, photo	525
24	46	State	ID	K. Woods, earrings	618
25	46	State	Evidence	S. Smith, earrings	676

			TMDEV OF EVIL	IDITEC	
1 2			INDEX OF EXHI	.B115	
3	NO.	STATE/DEFENSE	ID/EVIDENCE	TO/DESCRIPTION PAGE	
4	47	Defense	ID	V. Braswell, vibrator 771	
5	47	Defense	Evidence	V. Braswell, vibrator 777	
6	48	Defense	ID	V. Braswell, butterfly 772	
7	48	Defense	Evidence	V. Braswell, butterfly 777	
8	49	Defense	ID	V. Braswell, bullet 772	
9	49	Defense	Evidence	V. Braswell, bullet 777	
10	50	Defense	ID	V. Braswell, Nubby G 773	
11	50	Defense	Evidence	V. Braswell, Nubby G 777	
12	51	Defense	Evidence	V. Braswell, whips 777	
13	52	Defense	Evidence	V. Braswell, bullet 777	
14	53	State	Evidence	V. Braswell, photo 805	
15	54	State	Evidence	V. Braswell, photo 805	
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25			2		

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bailey, will you have 1 any additional proof? 2 MR. J. BAILEY: Your Honor, at this point in time 3 the defense is going to rest. 4 THE COURT: And, Ms. Weirich, will you have any 5 rebuttal proof? 6 MS. WEIRICH: No, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: You can rest when the jury comes in 8 and we'll get right into argument. 9 MR. J. BAILEY: Your Honor, just let me go ahead 10 and renew my earlier motion before Your Honor brings in the 11 jury for judgment of -- directed verdict of acquittal without 12 13 argument. THE COURT: Sure. And I'll deny it for the 14 reasons I've mentioned earlier. Are there any special 15 requests other than the curative instruction I gave them 16 earlier, which I plan to repeat in the charge? Anything else? 17 MR. J. BAILEY: What lesser includeds is Your 18 Honor planning to instruct? 19 THE COURT: All of the lesser includeds. 20 MR. J. BAILEY: Does that include reckless and 21 negligent homicide? Likewise, and I know Your Honor will give 22 the standards. I just want to ask. On the credibility of 23 witnesses when defendants testify, which is found in the 24 25 pattern jury instructions, 42.04, is Your Honor going to

charge that? 1 THE COURT: I'm going to charge the standard 2 charge I've always charged. 3 MR. J. BAILEY: I guess I'm asking the Court to 4 charge that. 5 THE COURT: Sure. The charge I give is either 6 identical to that or very close to it. 7 MR. J. BAILEY: And Your Honor is also going to 8 give the expert testimony charge? 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR. J. BAILEY: That would be it for the defense. 11 THE COURT: All right. Bring in the jury. 12 (Jury present.) 13 THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 14 We are ready to resume the trial at this time. Mr. Bailey, 15 any additional proof? 16 MR. J. BAILEY: Your Honor, at the present time 17 the defense rests. 18 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Carnesale, 19 20 Ms. Weirich, you may argue. MS. CARNESALE: Thank you, Judge. 21 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, on November 4th, 22 2004, or early morning hours of November 5th, 2004, Sheila 23 Braswell had the life squeezed out of her at the hands of that 24 man, her husband Vern Braswell. He put his hands around her 25

neck and he squeezed second after second, minute after minute until the blood vessels in her eyes burst, until the tiny blood vessels throughout her face, throughout her mouth burst under that pressure as he squeezed and squeezed this woman's neck, causing hemorrhaging throughout her entire neck, throughout the layers of muscle into the cartilage in her neck. He choked Sheila Braswell until she lost consciousness and she died. He literally choked the life out of Sheila Braswell in November of 2004.

The defendant wants you to believe that this occurred as an act of rough sex. In fact at her asking, at her request for a fix, that that's how this choking occurred. Ladies and gentlemen, Ms. Amy Weirich told you in voir dire that there are three things necessary for you to use in reaching a verdict in this case. Number one is the evidence that comes through the witnesses. And you've heard a lot of evidence this week. You've heard witnesses testify. You have a table full of exhibits that have been introduced. You are to take that evidence and Judge Dailey very shortly will give you the law in this case, the law that you apply to that evidence to reach a verdict.

And finally and very importantly what you came with, your common sense, ladies and gentlemen. You are to use your common sense. Remember what we heard this week in the evidence and take the law and apply it to that evidence. And

I'm going to ask you to do that right now as I talk to you this morning.

And let's go over what we heard this week with regards to how this woman had the life choked out of her last

November. The defendant and Ms. Braswell, Sheila, married in 1994. In 1995 the defendant was in rehab, and Sheila was living with a friend and went to visit him in rehab where he choked her, put his hands around her neck and squeezed until her voice became raspy, until she had marks on the neck that were visible hours later when she went home to her roommate. This wasn't an act of kinky sex. This wasn't at her request. This was out of anger at her. This was out of control that he was trying to exhibit with her.

Let's go forward a year to 1996. Sheila's still living with the defendant, still married to the defendant. They're living in Millington. And what happens? Another fight. The defendant's angry. And let's listen to what Sheila said happened. We've got some of her own words and you're welcome to review this, and I urge you to go over this in your deliberations. Let's hear what Sheila said. On the night of April 17th, 1996, between 10 and 11 p.m., my husband and I had a dispute. During this dispute he hit me, slapped me in my face, which resulted in a scratch on my right cheek and sore jawbones. He also choked me, pulled my hair, threw me up against the wall and chair, choked me from behind, cutting off

my air supply and told me to say my prayers. Do you think he told her once again to say her prayers in November of last year when he followed through on the choking? We'll never know. Sheila's not here to tell us.

But she did go get an order of protection after that incident. She still stayed with him. She was still married to him and she had kids with him. And we know that when she was pregnant with him, yet another altercation. Vera Cole, the defendant's sister-in-law who's married to his brother, a member of their family came forward to tell you what she knows about Sheila and their relationship. And she told you that Sheila appeared at her door late one night crying, upset, car packed full of her things. She wanted to come stay with her because she's pregnant and Vern had dragged her down the stairs by her hair, and Vera saw an injury to Sheila's mouth.

Ladies and gentlemen, use your common sense in evaluating what happened last November, what the defendant wants you to believe happened versus what you've heard was going on between them.

The defendant acquires a girlfriend Kristie Woods in 2002. She's a young girl, a small girl like Sheila, easy to control, easy to manipulate. She does what he wants. He sets her up in an apartment. Their relationship, according to both of them, has a lot to do with sex. Kristie told you they had sex as often as they could, pretty much any chance they got.

She's living in an apartment that he pays for and they date.

And eventually, he gets around to mentioning that he's married. This doesn't deter her and she continues to date him. But when she gets out of line, what does he do? Where does he put his hands?

She told you that at a party where she was dancing with other people, he got angry and he put his hands around her neck. And based on that, Kristie contacted Sheila, told Sheila that they were having an affair. What did Sheila do? Sheila met with her and talked to her, followed her home that night to make sure she got home okay, knowing that Vern had been calling all night long looking for Kristie.

Sheila files for divorce in June of '04 after that meeting. She has a lawyer. She files for divorce. She continues to pay that lawyer, but she also continues to live with Vern, to live with their kids, to continue in the marriage. Kristie continues to date Vern. He told you himself well, we didn't date after June. I still slept with her but I kept telling her, you know, we're just friends.

September of that year. Again, Kristie displeases

Vern. She actually has the audacity while he's living with

his wife to go out with someone else. What does he do? What

is his response to that? He put his hands around her neck,

chokes her, throws her up against the wall, bangs her head on

the wall. This is Vern Braswell.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge you to recall everything you've heard, to listen to the witnesses that you heard and what they told you and use your common sense to determine what you think is true.

Let's look at what happened the night Sheila died.

Let's look at what the defendant did. What did he say happened to anyone and everyone who would listen? The police, the paramedics, friends, family, anyone and everyone that he talked to and he talked to a whole host of people that morning of the fifth. And he told everyone who would listen we were having sex. I went and got in bed. She went and got in the bathtub. I went to sleep. I woke up. Sheila was dead or dying in the bathtub. She was submerged in water in the bathtub. That was his story over and over and over and over again. Not once to anyone in private, in public, to the police did he say this is so embarrassing but this is what we do and this is what happened. I choked her as a sex act and something went wrong. Not one single time was there any mention.

Look at his statement with the police officers. You have it in evidence. They go over the sex. They asked him did he ejaculate. He says no. They talked in intimate details of things of that nature. He had every single opportunity anyone would have in a small room with two male detectives to tell them this is so horrible but here's what we

do in the privacy of our bedroom. And, ladies and gentlemen, he never told them that because that's not what happened, I submit to you. He told everyone who would listen that she drowned in the bathtub.

Let's also look at how he acted that night. What were his actions? Was he acting like someone who just accidentally killed a loved one? Or was he acting like someone who was trying to cover something up? You have the records in evidence and I ask you to look at them. But let's consider all the phone calls he made. We've heard so much about his cell phones, his home phone, who he called. Vera Cole tells you that he called her house, his brother's cell phone at 1:36 a.m., right smack in the middle of the time that he's supposed to be having this night of love with his wife, he's calling his brother.

What we do know from the phone records is that the very first three phone calls he made after he found -- supposedly found his wife in the bathtub were to a Memphis Police Department Lieutenant John Mitchell, not a neighbor, not a doctor, not 911, to an acquaintance who is a high-up in the Memphis Police Department. Use your common sense, ladies and gentlemen. What was he trying to do? And after that only did he call 911, he continued to call John Mitchell over and over and over and over and over, 19, 20 times in the course of 40 minutes.

What was he trying to do? John Mitchell wasn't the only one. He called other police officers that he knew, not close friends. These weren't close friends. These weren't family members. What do those actions reveal? Those actions reveal that this was a man who was panicked, who was afraid and who was trying to figure out what he was going to do because he had just killed his wife. He had just murdered his wife and he didn't want 911 there until he figured out what he was going to do.

We heard the 911 call. Did that make any sense?

Sheila Braswell was 4-foot-11 inches, 125 pounds. He tells
the 911 operator he can't get her out of the bathtub, can't
get her out of the bathtub. I'm trying. I'm scared.

Finally, she says, sir, can you drain the water out of the
bathtub then? If you can't lift her out of the bathtub,
you've got to get her out of that bathtub because of course
the 911 operator thinks she's drowning. Again, Vern Braswell
trying to cover up what he's done.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I also want you to consider his actions and what took place afterwards. Were those actions, were what Vern Braswell did actions that were consistent with someone who loved his wife and accidentally killed her in a bizarre sex episode? Or were those actions consistent with someone who just killed his wife because she's divorcing him and he was angry and when he gets angry he

chokes?

Let's think about what he did afterwards. You heard the jail calls. You heard his demeanor from the jail. You heard his priorities from the jail, what he talked about, what he was concerned with, how he acted. And you heard that he kept calling Kristie Woods, a woman that he supposedly broke up with five months earlier. He asked about her all the time. How's "The Soldier"? Have you heard from "The Soldier"? What's "The Soldier" doing? Is "The Soldier" underground?

Finally, he gets through to Kristie and he talks to her at work because in fact, her mother took her underground as we heard, to get her away from that man who had just killed one woman. He talks to Kristie Woods and what is he saying to her? Does he say leave me alone, leave my wife alone, leave my family alone as he insists that's the only thing he would say to her? No. He says you're my favorite cousin. Here's how you can write me and keep it secret. I communicate with you through my thoughts and through my dreams. Vern Braswell was every bit as involved with Kristie Woods in November and December of 2004 as he was a year earlier.

Ladies and gentlemen, use your common sense in examining everything you've heard and everything that I'm telling you this morning. Everything we've heard this week are actions and incidents consistent with someone who murdered his wife, who murdered this woman, mother of two, beloved

friend of many.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now the Judge is going to instruct you on the law. And the law in this case is very important. I'm going to touch on that just for a moment with you right now. Vern Braswell is charged with first degree murder. First degree murder is defined as the following: Any person who commits the offense of first degree murder is guilty of a crime. For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense the State must have proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the following essential elements: That the defendant unlawfully killed the alleged victim, Sheila Braswell; and that the defendant acted intentionally. A person acts intentionally with respect to the nature of the conduct or to a result of the conduct when it is the person's conscious objective or desire to engage in the conduct or cause the result. And finally, that the killing was premeditated. A premeditated act is one done after the exercise of reflection and judgment. Premeditation means that the intent to kill must have been formed prior to the act itself. It is not necessary that the purpose to kill preexist in the mind of the accused for any definite period of time.

There is no definite period of time required. There is no five minutes and up. Two minutes and up. 60 seconds and up requirement for premeditation. All it means is that the intent to kill must have existed prior to the act.

Now the Judge is also required under the law to charge you with what is called "lesser included offenses," lesser degrees of murder. So you will hear about first degree murder, but the Judge is also required to give you lesser includeds; second degree murder, voluntary manslaughter, reckless homicide, negligent homicide.

But, ladies and gentlemen, he will instruct you it is your duty to consider the charged offense first degree murder. You are to deliberate on that offense first. And unless and until you unanimously decide that he is not guilty of the first degree murder, it is only then that you are to consider the lesser included offenses.

Last November Sheila Braswell had the life choked out of her by the defendant. We will never know exactly how that happened, exactly what angered Vern Braswell that night, what he found, what he thought that he decided once again to take control of Sheila Braswell, show her who's boss. Perhaps it was the divorce check dated October 24th that was in the kitchen that her mother found. Perhaps he found that. Who knows. We will never know exactly what ticked him off, but what we do know beyond any reasonable doubt is that he put his hands around her neck and he squeezed the life out of Sheila Braswell. He did this unlawfully. He did this intentionally. And he did this with premeditation, taking at least three minutes of constant pressure as we heard from Dr. Joye Carter

to squeeze and squeeze until the life left her body.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now time for you to hold

Vern Braswell accountable for what he did. It's time for you

to find him guilty as charged of first degree murder. And I

ask you to do that this morning.

THE COURT: Mr. Bailey.

MR. W. BAILEY: May it please, Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Let me first at the outset thank you for your patience and attention that you've given throughout this trial. You have agreed when you raised your hand, took the oath to serve as this panel, you agreed to discharge one of the highest callings that a citizen in this country can render and that is jury service. You agreed and took the oath that you would follow the law. And let me quickly say that jury service is something that everybody in the world doesn't have the opportunity of doing. And fortunately in this country, an indictment alone or a charge, an accusation doesn't get you snatched off the streets and held indefinitely without benefit of a trial. That's what we do here.

Now, you made certain promises when you were being voir dired or examined. And those promises consisted of the first being that you would follow the law. The second promise being -- and apply the law. The second promise being that you would look at the evidence and weigh the evidence and be persuaded

by the evidence alone, that you wouldn't be motivated by sympathy one way or the other. And it's easy in a murder case to be swayed by or driven by emotions of the moment because we do have a life that was lost. And nobody regrets that, the proof is going to show, as much as our client Vern Braswell. But he can't bring her back. You can't bring her back.

The other thing you promised is that you would call a ball a ball and a strike a strike. You said that you would be objective and fair, that you wouldn't lean one way or the other. You wouldn't lean for the prosecution, nor would you lean for the defense, but you make this a level playing field.

We also talked about burden of proof. You said and you promised when you took your oath that you would require the prosecution, these prosecutors, these fine prosecutors, to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And you said you wouldn't look at suspicion or go on good instinct or look to extraneous material outside the proof in this case. You said you would apply your common senses. And you said if reasonable doubt wasn't established, and each one of you said that your course would be simple, you said that you would return a verdict of not guilty. That's what you said.

You also said that this young man sits over here enshrouded with one of the most sacred cloaks and that is a presumption of innocence. And you said you wouldn't -- that you would give him the benefit of that presumption. And you

said that that presumption wouldn't be removed unless it was with cogent, competent, convincing proof, that as far as you're concerned, that his sitting over here as a defendant doesn't mean anything to you, that you would wipe that out of your minds the fact that he's sitting over here charged. And we talked about the grand jury indictment. And we talked about the indictment being no more than a summons to get him to appear in court, that he has to honor his appearance once you're indicted, just like in a civil case, I instructed the analogy.

We talked about a civil case and I showed you the difference that in a civil case is by greater weight or preponderance of the evidence, which is a far cry different from proof beyond a reasonable doubt in a criminal case. Standard of proof is entirely different. You're talking about a whole different ball game.

We talked about direct and circumstantial evidence.

You promised that if the circumstantial evidence chain didn't follow the links, didn't connect like in a bracelet, follow the links, don't connect, you don't have a bracelet. That's what you said. And His Honor is going to charge you the guidelines involving circumstantial evidence.

This is not a direct evidence case. We talked about direct evidence being where somebody said I saw what happened, I was there. In this case this case is built entirely, this

man is charged entirely on circumstantial evidence, entirely on circumstantial evidence.

Now one other thing on your promise and then I'm -- I'm going to talk about this evidence. You said that if you had some reservation, some moral reservation about guilt --

MS. WEIRICH: May we approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

(Bench conference commenced.)

MS. WEIRICH: There's no charge on moral certainty.

THE COURT: I don't plan to charge on moral certainty. I haven't since, I guess since Judge Nixon in Middle Tennessee reversed a death penalty case when it was charged.

MR. W. BAILEY: Very well.

(Said bench conference concluded.)

MR. W. BAILEY: Thank you, Your Honor. That if you had reservation where you couldn't, after leaving this courtroom, feel that you did the right thing, that there was proof beyond a reasonable doubt, that you'd resolve those reservations in favor of this young man sitting over here.

Now you heard -- the Court is going to charge you about first degree murder. He's going to charge you about other degrees of homicide; first degree, second degree, manslaughter, criminal negligent homicide and negligent

homicide. He's going to walk you through those. I won't take the time to do that. That's the Court's job, that's Judge Dailey's responsibility.

But I will talk with you about the elements of first degree. And one of the things that's required, a key element is premeditation, premeditation. That means that you must plan to kill. That you must kill with an intent. It can't be passionately driven. There must be a certain calmness about the killing. It can't be sporadic without pre-planning. And it must be intentional. You must have committed premeditation with one thing in mind, that is a death to result. Now if you don't find that in this case after having examined the proof when you deliberate, then your job is clear, that's required that you do the right thing and you find this young man not quilty of premeditation and intentional murder.

There are certain -- you heard the testimony. And let me tell you one thing that runs throughout this testimony. And that this man was at the point of a nervous breakdown, that he was in uncontrollable sobbing, that he was crying on the telephone trying to get help, that he called several people trying to get help. Now, does that show the calmness and the cold-bloodedness of somebody who just committed first degree murder?

There are certain areas of reasonable doubt in this case that leap out at you. I have pinpointed seven of them.

I'm going to walk you through. The first area of reasonable doubt is quite apparent. It stands out like a sore thumb. It's called motive. It's called motive.

Here's a young man who's at the peak of his career.

Four months earlier he just got an outstanding promotion after having worked himself up from a substitute teacher in the school system, he's worked himself up to assistant principal, four months earlier. He's got everything going for him. Why would he want to blow it? Why would he want to blow it? It doesn't make sense. It does violence to your common sense to think that he'd want to blow it.

He's got two young kids; one five, one seven. Adores both of them. Why would he want to blow it? It does violence to your common sense.

Let's talk about his wife. You heard a lot of discussion about what he and his wife did prior to '96 about him grabbing her by the hair and abusing her. But did you hear anybody come here and take that witness stand and talk about what he did to her after '96? Was there any live testimony to come up here on this stand and say that he mistreated his wife after '96? You heard about him running around, but did you hear him talk about, anybody talk about him abusing his wife after '96? That's nine years since anybody talked about him physically abusing his wife, nine years ago. Does that not do violence to your common sense?

He had everything going they did as a couple. They traveled together.

But now his running around got him involved with Chastity (sic) Woods. And what did he try to do? What does the proof show? That's what we're talking about. We're talking about evidence. What does the proof show happened between him and Chastity (sic) Woods? The proof shows he tried to break it off. That's what the proof shows. In June he tried to break it off. He said leave -- I wanted her to leave my family alone.

Now we talked earlier about this not being a case of morality, that you're not here to evaluate the propriety or his conduct regarding his relationship with Ms. Woods.

Ms. Woods is a fine lady. And those things happen. Those things have always happened and will continue to happen, and we're not here to wage a campaign against infidelity. That's not our job here today.

He had a business. The business was going well. Why would he want to blow it? He didn't have a motive.

Now let's talk about number two area of reasonable doubt. Let's talk about the environment in which this young lady's death occurred and the circumstances. Is there any suggestion that somebody had a weapon? Anybody bludgeoned her to death or a firearm or a stabbing? But more importantly, where did her death result, ladies and gentlemen? Her death

resulted in the bathroom right next to the bedroom where these two fine young children rest sleeping. Does that not do violence to your common sense, that one would deliberately with premeditation, intentionally kill his wife with neighbors next door with his children in the next bedroom? Does that comport with common sense? I submit to you that that's reasonable doubt area number two.

Let's look at his conduct, reasonable doubt area number three. Let's look at his conduct in terms of whether it squares with one who's a cold-calculated killer, planned a killing. You heard the prosecutor here earlier say by her own admission that he didn't know what to do, to start calling around to his buddies. Is that more consistent with one who's had an accidental situation tragedy in the family or one who cold-bloodedly and calculatedly planned a killing? I submit to you the one who coldly and calculatedly and calmly plans a killing always has an exit strategy. You know what you're going to do. You know where you're going. You've planned this. You've got a cover-up. You've got a scheme. Where is the reasonable doubt proof here about a scheme? There is none.

Reasonable doubt area number four, I believe, the next area. Where is proof? You've seen the witnesses. You've heard from the witnesses. You've heard and seen exhibits that His Honor has permitted to be introduced. Where is the proof

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of intent? Where is proof of intent? You could say we know that there was an intent if he took a weapon and shot her because you know that a gun is calculated to result in death. But where is the intent here? And where is the premeditation? Where is the planning? Where is the cold-bloodedness?

The next area of reasonable doubt. You heard from the medical examiner. You heard from the police. And another thing from that leaps out at you like a sore thumb. Where is evidence of a struggle? No body wounds. The medical examiner said that would be important. You saw the photographs of her with her hands in bags to preserve the fingerprint. That's important because if you're being -- if you're struggling you're going to ward off instinctively and here's where you really use your common sense, ladies and gentlemen. Here's where you really use your common sense. If you're being the subject of an intentional strangulation you'd struggle. That's just instinctive. There is nothing, nothing in the record here, nothing to suggest that there was a struggle. There's nothing. And the medical examiner said that would be important, that's why we look for body wounds, defensive body wounds to see whether there was a struggle. Those fingernails give us important information. They were intact. There was nothing to suggest that there was any struggle or had a fight. Very important. Those are your very survival instincts that come into play when you're being attacked is a struggle.

your common sense.

The next area of reasonable doubt, let's talk about the sexual practices of this couple. And everybody -- nobody condemns anybody because of your sex practice. That's your own private domain. This is not a trial about one's sexual practices. You're not here to pass judgment on that. You're not to be judgmental on one's sexual practices. That's about as sacred as one's religion. That's something that everybody's entitled to, his or her lifestyle. This is not a trial about a lifestyle. But it just so happens that we've got involved here kinky sex, violent, rough, kinky sex. Rough sex. Rough sex.

Now if you want to convict him because he was involved in rough sex, then go ahead. But I don't think you're going to do that. I think you're going to follow your oath and keep your promise, that you're going to look for premeditation. If that's not there, then your course is clear.

Now let's talk about their sexual practice. Let's talk about erotic asphyxiation. You've heard from the paramedic who talked about erotic asphyxiation. You heard from the medical examiner who talked about erotic asphyxiation. And you heard from our client who told you in graphic detail what was involved, how he and his wife had their sexual practice.

And one of the things that you should look at, I say respectfully, is the detail in which he explained it. Even to

the point of when he or she, rather, did her tapping to let him know to back off, you're choking me too much or where she would go limp. And isn't that consistent with the practice?

And we knew that there would be a strange area in which to venture. So that's why we got one of the leading clinical sexual experts in this country to come here and share and give you jurors and give the Court and give myself some insight into what that was all about. You heard from Dr. Schwartz from Johns Hopkins University. And one of the things about Dr. Schwartz is that he is mechanical. When I say "mechanical," he doesn't know anybody here. Doesn't know me. Doesn't know this young man over here, Mr. Braswell. Doesn't know anybody. Doesn't know the prosecutors. So he came to do one thing, to provide information for the benefit of you jurors and the Court. He wanted to walk us through the tunnel of that kinky sex experience called "asphyxiation."

And he, just like the medical examiner said and just like the paramedic said, he emphasized that it involves a certain amount of choking, which is a euphemism for strangulation. It involves just another name for strangulation. It involves a certain amount of choking.

Why do we have these sex toys on the table? Why were they introduced into evidence? It certainly wasn't designed to embarrass anybody. It certainly wasn't designed to offend you jurors. It was designed to do one thing, to show you the

lifestyle, the sexual lifestyle that's consistent with the kinky sex of the choking sex for heightened sexual arousal. That's why we brought the sex toys.

And you even heard the medical examiner say that in her experience with this kinky experience called "erotic asphyxiation," the sex toys as part of the crime scene would be important, would provide her information. One thing that we know. One thing we know in that sex play of choking, that it's risky. But the other thing is and incidentally, mind you, nobody took that stand and say -- and deny that not one piece of shred of evidence that contradicts that this was their sex practice, not one.

Now there is proof that not only did this young man engage with it with the decedent, his wife, but also when he was having sex with Ms. Woods and she demonstrated. She grabbed Mr. Lafferty, the deputy sitting over here, from behind and demonstrated for your satisfaction how he -- how this applied, what went on in this kinky sexual experience.

But again, please, now if you decide this case on a moral basis, if you get off into the morality of it in terms of whether that was right or wrong, then we don't stand a chance. But you're not going to do that. You're going to look at the evidence. You're going to look at the presumption of innocence and reasonable doubt.

Now you've heard a lot of -- of some testimony, I

should say, about him prior to '96 having marital difficulties with his wife. But let me assure you, let me assure you that's a smoke screen. That's a smoke screen. When the proof is weak or reasonable doubt, you throw up a smoke screen. You bring in and you trot in all this other stuff. They've got no bearing on what happened on November 4th. You bring all of that in, tongue-in-cheek saying I'm not trying to say that because he did that, that he did it on November 4th but I'm just trying to show that he had the disposition or that it goes to his motive or his intent. There's nothing in the record about him ever having tried to kill his wife. Nothing in the proof about that. It's a smoke screen.

You know, I mentioned a tree earlier in my opening statement and I guess some of you say well what in the world are you talking about in terms of a tree? I'm talking about that tree of reasonable doubt, that tree of reasonable doubt. It's just as strong as any oak tree in this county. And you -- you can't move that tree, Prosecutors, with a chain by trying to cut it down limb by limb. You can't yank down. That tree stands firmly affixed in the courtroom in the middle of it. And the only way you can get that tree, to move that tree of reasonable doubt, the only way you can get that tree of reasonable doubt overcome or removed is by proof, cogent and convincing proof. And if you don't, that tree still stands.

And let me finally say that I don't get the opportunity of making the last comments. Under our procedural rules, the prosecutor makes the first opening statement and the prosecutor is last at bat with the last statements, last comments. Last people you hear from will be these prosecutors. You won't hear from us. When I sit, our defense is done. It's up to you. But one of the things I want to remind you is that these prosecutors weren't at the scene.

Neither was I. So we don't know what happened. All those prosecutors are doing are theorizing. That's all they're doing. They don't know anymore about this case than you.

But when they get up here behind us, I want you to look at them and I want you to ask them, say where is the motive?

Why in the world did this young man want to kill his wife, two fine children, two fine kids five and seven, everything going for him just got a career promotion? Why in the world would he want to kill his wife? Make her answer that.

Also, look at her and make her answer with proof beyond a reasonable doubt as to how come he would do such a horrible thing with the children in the next bedroom. The next thing is say, Ms. Prosecutor, where is the intent? Ms. Prosecutor, where is the intent? Where is the premeditation? Where is the planning?

And finally, I want you to look at them and say

Ms. Prosecutor, they both were involved in this kinky sex

practice and we heard how it occurred. We heard the defendant's account of what happened. And we know he didn't tell the police initially. We know that in his statement he didn't say to the police I was having kinky sex. But,

Ms. Prosecutor, did you expect him to say that to the police?

Using your common sense, would he say I was having kinky sex to the police? Ms. Prosecutor, why was this man just in uncontrollable distress? Why did he cry and constantly cry, cry to Ms. Braswell's mother? She defined him as constantly sobbing. Why was he constantly sobbing? You saw him on the witness stand. Why was this man in such emotional turmoil and distress? Is this the mark of a cold, calculated killer?

Absolutely not. It defies your common sense. It does violence to it. Look at her and make her -- and ask her that.

Ask her, say why are you bringing this smoke scene here about all of those other events that have nothing to do with November 4th? Is that not smoke in mirrors? Is not that to try to suggest that maybe something else happened? What relevancy does that have to November 4th, Ms. Prosecutor, if it's not a smoke screen?

Again, I want to thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

You've been very patient and very attentive. And I'm not going to try -- I wouldn't dare try to go over everybody's testimony. You heard it. You made notes. You did a very good job of following this trial, all of you. And for that,

there's one thing that you give this young man, our client
Mr. Braswell, justice. That's all he's asking, justice.
Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take about

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take about a ten-minute recess at this time. As always, do not discuss the case in any way among yourselves during the recess.

(Jury out.)

THE COURT: Take him out. Stand in recess. (Recess.)

THE COURT: Bring out the defendant, please. All right. I don't care if anybody else comes in or not, but are there others that intend to come in? If there are, I'd prefer that they come in before we resume the argument and charge.

DEPUTY WILLIAMS: They're not out here, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Then bring in the jury, please.

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: Ms. Weirich.

MS. WEIRICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

It's November 5th, 2004, around two o'clock in the morning, maybe a few minutes before. The defendant gets home. We know he's not home around 11 because he's called Kristie Woods, told her that he had been at the club waiting on the heating and air guy. He tells her he's on his way home. Maybe he is, maybe he isn't. We know he calls his brother's

cell phone at 1:36 and then again at 1:38. Well, he couldn't have been killing his wife while he was calling his brother's cell phone and he couldn't have been making love to his wife while he was calling his brother's cell phone. So what's he doing?

Suppose for a minute that he's driving home or maybe still at the club or maybe God knows where else. He gets home around two and his wife's in the tub. She's taking a bath. Think for a minute. This is a man who has been cheating on Sheila Braswell for two years at this point, two years. Have you heard anybody tell you that Sheila Braswell and Vern Braswell had an open marriage, whatever you wanted to do was fine? No. He was cheating on his wife. Do you think Sheila Braswell was real happy to see him at two o'clock in the morning or whenever it was about that time that he got home November 5th, 2004? Do you think she greeted him with open arms? No.

Suppose for just a minute that she's in the tub and she starts arguing with him. She's had it. She's filed for divorce. She's met Kristie Woods. She's asked Kristie Woods to leave her husband alone.

I told you in opening statement that Sheila Braswell was flip-flopping between leaving Vern Braswell and trying to keep her family together. She filed for divorce. She didn't move out. Those two things are inconsistent, yes.

Going back to 1995 when we know he beat her and choked her and Magra Harden tried to get her to do something about it. She never would. But she had finally in the summer of 2004 taken some action and filed this complaint for divorce. You'll have it back in the jury room. You can read through it. Plaintiff would show to the Court that the Defendant is guilty of such inappropriate marital conduct as renders cohabitation unsafe and improper. That's not just a we ain't getting along anymore. She'd had it. So he comes strolling in around two o'clock in the morning. Do you think maybe she thought he's been with Kristie Woods again? Here he is telling me we're going to work it out. Here he is telling me we're going to make things right. What's he doing out at two o'clock in the morning on a Thursday night, Friday night?

But see, what Sheila Braswell forgot that fateful night, her last night, while she was sitting in her tub that would soon become her coffin, she forgot the fundamental rule of being in a relationship with the defendant. And that rule is nobody tells me what to do. Nobody tells me where to go and when to come home. You, Sheila Braswell, better act right. But I can carry on with whomever I want to whenever. Nobody leaves Vern Braswell.

You saw what happened. You heard what happened.

(Timer went off.)

MS. WEIRICH: That's five minutes from the moment

I stood up and started talking to you until now when that beeper went off, that's five minutes. If we split the time in which Dr. Carter told you that it would take for Sheila Braswell's neck to be squeezed through the six layers of hemorrhaging that she saw, that's how long. Maybe even more. Maybe a little less. But that's how long.

But let's get back to what probably happened that night. You heard from Kristie Woods' own mouth what that defendant did to her when she was seeing other men. Never mind the fact that he's married. Never mind the fact that he goes home to his wife and kids every night. My women don't make me look like a fool because I'm in control. I'm calling the shots. Kristie Woods had the audacity to dance with someone at a party. You heard what happened to her. He put his hands on her neck. Ms. Woods, was it a loving, playful kind of hold? No, ma'am. Did it hurt? Yes, ma'am. Was he applying pressure to your neck? Yes, ma'am.

And then in September of 2004, when he found out once again that she had the audacity to be seeing another man, never mind the fact that he's married and has two kids, what did he do that day? He pushed her down on the couch. He threw her up against the wall. He bashed her head against the wall. And then as one final point of emphasis, as one final reminder that I'm in control, he took her head, her small tiny neck and slammed it against a glass coffee table.

Ms. Woods, was it a playful kind of hold? No, ma'am. Was it the same kind of hold he would sometimes do when you two were having sex? No, ma'am, it was nothing like that. Did it hurt you? Yes, ma'am. Did it scare you? Yes, ma'am. So we know what happens to the women in Vern Braswell's life that try to tell him what to do.

They get their hair pulled. They get drug down the stairs. They get choked to the point that hours later Magra Harden can see the injuries on her. They get choked to the point that hours later Magra Harden can hear that her voice is different. So he moseys in around two in the morning. His wife has the nerve to question where he's been. And he teaches her that final lesson. He won. He won.

He held her neck in that tub, ladies and gentlemen, but there was no struggle. If there was no struggle, why did Sheronda Smith find long hair, lots of long hair in the tub when she drained it out? You heard her testify. This wasn't just hair that you lose anyway in the shower. This was long hair that belonged to Sheila.

If there was no struggle in the tub, why are there two ladies' earrings and a man's nipple ring in the bottom of the tub? Is that where people normally keep their jewelry?

That's your sign of a struggle, ladies and gentlemen. She's grabbing at him any way she can. He's got her pushed up against the wall of the tub. We're talking about a tub that

from wall to wall is five-foot-one inch. We're not talking about a swimming pool. She's got nowhere to go. She's got no way to escape. He's got her up against that back corner and she's grabbing at him the best she can. Why isn't there any evidence under her fingernails? She was under water. She sat in that water. You heard Dr. Carter tell you the washer woman effect, the wrinkleness that we see that develops on the skin after you've been in the water, it was more pronounced on the hands than the feet. You heard her tell you that. Washes away.

You see, we don't get to make the crime scene, ladies and gentlemen. Prosecutors and police officers aren't called before defendants decide to squeeze the life out of somebody. We're not notified and told to bring note pads and video cameras. We get what they leave us. When he finally after three, four, five, six or maybe seven minutes of squeezing her neck with his hands, when he finally sees he's done, does he panic? Of course he panics. Nobody kills wanting to be caught. There's never been a murderer walk through these doors that wanted to get caught, that wanted a jury to stand up and say, you know what? We, the jury, find you guilty of murder in the first degree. Of course he panicked. But he wasn't about to undo what he wanted to do. He wasn't about to get her out of that water and try to help her.

Did he call his neighbor, the guy that came over to get

the kids, the guy that was concerned enough and friend enough to come and say let me come get the kids? He didn't call him. Come help me get her out of the tub. And this is a man that you heard testimony who carried his wife when she was pregnant. He couldn't lift her. Everyone who took the stand said there was no reason she couldn't have been removed from that tub. Where there's a will, there's a way. The problem was he had her right where he wanted her. He had her right where he wanted her, dead.

But why didn't the boys hear anything? How much screaming is she going to be able to do? How much noise is she going to be able to make when he is squeezing her so hard that Dr. Carter sees hemorrhaging through all six layers of the neck and all around? Bursts blood vessels in every part of her face, her mouth, the piece of ligament that connects your lip to your gum for God's sake, the pooling of the blood in the eyes. How much screaming is she going to be able to do?

Who does he call? His good buddy, best friend, just talked to him an hour before Lieutenant John Mitchell with the Memphis Police Department. You heard Mr. Mitchell testify. Came in, in uniform. Been a lieutenant for many, many years. Been with the police department many, many years. He called him at 3:55:57, 3:56:47, 3:57:17. The first of those calls was 12 seconds. The second was three. The third was four.

Then he called 911.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Y'all heard the tape and you can take it back to the jury room and listen to it again. He's wailing I want to help my wife. Help my wife. Come help my wife. Maybe what would have helped your wife the most is if she'd gone on and left you the first time you choked her. Maybe if she'd listened to Magra Harden, that would have been the best help Sheila Braswell could have gotten.

He finally gets around to calling 911 and they carry on trying to get him to get her out of the tub. And then you hear him on the cell phone calling somebody else. Why is he calling these law enforcement people? For the very reason that you're sitting here today, so he can come into court and say but I called law enforcement people. What cold-blooded, calculated murderer in their right mind would call law enforcement people after they've killed their wife? The kind that think they're in control of everybody and every situation. The kind who call the shots. The kind who think they're above the law. If I call all my friends that I know from the police department and the fire department, then I can come in some day and tell a jury call I called law enforcement personnel. He called them to try to scam them. No, he didn't flee to California. No, he didn't run out of the house and leave his two boys there. He's in control, ladies and gentlemen.

This is his drama that he's written. If he really wanted to help his wife, he didn't want her dead, why wasn't 911 the first call he made? Children. Children in kindergarten know that in the case of an emergency you dial 911. You mean to tell me that a man with a master's degree doesn't know that? Give me a break.

He calls them at 3:57:48. The paramedics told you they arrived around four. The air was still moist and the water was still very warm. All of the paramedics and EMTs that touched the water told you that to their hand through their gloves the water was warm. An hour later at 5:07 the water was tested, and I believe it was 94.6 degrees, which is warm enough for an adult to take a bath.

So why is the water still warm? Why an hour after the paramedics had been there is the water still warm if Mr.

Watson, Mr. Darryl -- I've forgotten his last name but the man from Watson's Pool and Spa, told you that in a tub like this, which is not a jacuzzi, it's a home bathtub with jacuzzi jets, in a bathtub like this, you're going to have to add hot water less than every 15 minutes. So why is that water still hot?

Because he wanted everybody to think she drowned. So he ran more hot water. He turned on that hot water as hard and fast as he could while he's dialing all his phones and calling all his buddies and pushing all the numbers. Hey, this is perfect. She's in the tub anyway.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

See, when -- I kept waiting for the defendant or somebody to say that they were having this night of erotic asphyxia that he kept wanting to talk about. Boy, he liked talking about that, didn't he? Didn't want to talk about a lot of other things. Didn't want to talk about some of the chokings. Wanted to deny all of that. The only choking he wanted to admit to is the one that, well, we've got spelled out here in black and white that Judge Robilio signed, the order of protection. All the others though, no. They're just lies. People coming in and lying on him. But he sure wanted to talk to y'all in detail about the private life that he and Sheila Braswell shared. The ironic thing about that is there is only two people that know the truth about what happened that night, that man right there who has every reason in the world to tell you a story and Sheila Braswell.

But anyway, he wanted to talk all about that. And I kind of kept waiting for him to say that they were having this night of fun sex that lasted for, what, three hours according to him? And that she died after the asphyxia and he put her in the tub to cover it up. I kept waiting for that. Unh-unh, he didn't say that. He never said that. He didn't think it through very well. She was already in the tub taking her own bath. That's why her glasses are laid gently to the side of the tub. They weren't knocked off of her in a struggle. She took them off when she got in the tub. But he ran more hot

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

water to make it look like a drowning. When the police got there, when the EMTs got there, when anybody with ears got there, that's what he told them.

We were having sex in the tub, then we got out of the tub and we went in the bed and she got up about 1:30 because her legs were hurting her and she got back in the tub. Something made me wake up, even though I'm a hard sleeper, even though I don't wake up very easily, something made me get up and I found her dead in the tub. She must have drown. then the police start looking around and they start doing the job that we want them to do, looking at everything, talking to the only person who was a witness, the defendant. They didn't immediately charge him with murder and take him down here and throw him in a cell. And you heard Sergeant Kjellin say that, you know, we like to talk to witnesses before friends and family and the media and everything can influence what they tell us. So Sergeant Kjellin pulled him aside at the house and said -- just the two of them, just two men -- what happened? We were having sex in the tub. We got out of the We got back in the bed, had sex, my wife's legs were She got back in the tub. I woke up two hours later and she was dead. See, it wasn't adding up. And his story he was trying to sell you yesterday doesn't add up either, ladies and gentlemen, not one bit.

We don't want you to just look at one side of the

picture. This isn't about the prosecution and the defense and us against them and them against us. We are at the point in the criminal justice process where those roads have converged. Those roads have come together in front of you. And it is your responsibility to fulfill the oath you took, to uphold the laws of the State of Tennessee, to look at everything, not just the fact that he choked her in 1995 therefore he must have killed her in November of 2004, that he choked her in 1996 therefore he must have killed her in 2004, that he choked her in 1997, pulled her hair and drug her down the stairs when she was pregnant therefore he must have killed her in 2004.

Mr. Bailey wants you to ask me why it's relevant, why I would bring you that proof. I'll tell you. That goes to motive. That's intent, ladies and gentlemen. That goes to show that it was a lack of mistake, that it was not an accident.

You see, once he realized that we might know all that stuff, what else is he going to say? How else is he going to explain away the fact that he had his hands on her neck that night? Oh, I know. I can say she wanted it. You can say whatever you want. But this process, ladies and gentlemen, the reason that you are all here is to return a verdict that truth dictates and justice demands.

In a moment Judge Dailey is going to read to you the law that applies to this case; murder in the first degree,

premeditated murder. We talked about that in voir dire and opening statement. What is premeditation? Premeditation does not have to exist in the mind of that defendant for any set period of time. It only has to exist before you start choking her. And while you keep applying that pressure for five, six, maybe seven minutes, that, ladies and gentlemen, is premeditation.

We can also look to someone's behavior after the murder to see what they intended to do, to see what they premeditated. What did he do? He tried to surround himself with his buddies and take control just like he did with Sheila Braswell, just like he did with Kristie Woods. You heard him on those jail tapes. If you want to, go back and listen to the hours and hours of them. You heard Sergeant Merritt testify that he listened to all of them.

The defendant never once cried for his wife. You heard what he was worried about, his palm pilot, somebody get me my palm pilot. Somebody get that club cleaned out. Make sure "The Soldier" is underground. Is "The Soldier" underground? Hey, we've got to talk gender-neutral here. Do you remember them talking about that? Don't say "she" on the tape because they might figure out who we're talking about here. We've got to talk gender neutral, "The Soldier." Why was he so busy trying to hide her if she wasn't part of the motive? Why was he so busy trying to hide her if she wasn't the reason he was

going to get rid of his wife and make it right for he and Kristie?

He's still sticking to the story that they broke off the relationship in June of '04. She told you she last talked to him a few months ago. They've been communicating. He talked to her that night that he went home and killed his wife. He lied about her to Judge Dailey at a bond hearing this summer. If she's not the motive, why lie about her? Why make up all this?

Judge Dailey will instruct you on the murder first, first. And then he will go to murder second and voluntary manslaughter and reckless homicide and criminally negligent homicide.

Murder second degree is a knowing killing. What it lacks that murder first has is premeditation. Okay. But you didn't necessarily think about it, but maybe you're in a fight with somebody, you get a gun and you shoot them. Or maybe they made you mad three weeks ago at school or wherever and you get a gun. He's got a gun. Y'all are arguing or whatever and the shots are fired.

Voluntary manslaughter is a killing in the heat of passion. The classic example is when has husband comes home and finds his wife in the bed with another man and he loses it and shoots them both or shoots one of them.

Reckless homicide is on New Year's Eve when you go

2.2

outside at the stroke of midnight and shoot a gun in the air for fun and unfortunately, the bullet falls three blocks away and kills an eight year old in bed. You didn't plan to hurt anybody. You didn't put your hands around anybody's neck and hold them and apply all the pressure that your five-foot-four-inch body could until the life was sucked out of her.

Criminally negligent homicide is the tragedy that we all live through every summer in Memphis when babies are left in cars. Someone makes a mistake, a horrible mistake and somebody dies. That's criminally negligent homicide.

The reason I go through all this with you is when

Judge Dailey reads to you the law that applies to each of

those charges, and again, the law requires that he do that,

that he read these charges to you. When he reads them to you,

you're going to think well, criminally negligent homicide,

reckless homicide, voluntary manslaughter, murder second, all

of those seem to fit this situation. Of course they do.

Because as we move up the rungs of the ladder to murder in the

first degree, those lesser includeds are swallowed up. Okay.

The lesser includeds of criminally negligent, reckless homicide, voluntary manslaughter and murder second are all included within murder first degree. All right. So as you go and listen to those, you're going to think that sounds like --

MR. J. BAILEY: Your Honor, may we approach?

THE COURT: You may.

(Bench conference commenced.)

MR. J. BAILEY: Your Honor, that's an improper argument. Your Honor's instruction and the law in Tennessee is they are to first consider murder in the first degree and go down. And what she's telling them is that as they look at these things and go up the rung, that's not how it's done.

THE COURT: No, no. I think she's just explaining the definition that elements that are so tuned by the greater and the lessers, just logically one of them could assume that. But no, she's not -- in fact, Ms. Carnesale told them just the opposite, you start from murder first and work your way down.

(Said bench conference concluded.)

MS. WEIRICH: Those lessers that I talked to you about are consumed by the greater charge of murder in the first degree. And what murder in the first degree has that the others don't is the premeditation, okay. So you'll hear that charge.

The other charge I want to talk to you briefly about is credibility of witnesses. You've heard from a lot of witnesses this week. And they are all -- you can ignore all of what somebody has told you. You can ignore none of what they have told you. You can ignore some of it and accept some of it. And every witness that takes the stand is judged by the same set of standards under the law of the State of

Tennessee. And I believe Judge Dailey will tell you, and if he tells you something differently, listen to what Judge Dailey tells you. You are the exclusive judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight to be given to their testimony.

If there are conflicts in the testimony of the different witnesses, like when Vern Braswell tells you I didn't call my brother that night or when Vern Braswell tells you I didn't choke Sheila Braswell at the rehab center, those kinds of things and you've heard from other people that it did happen, if there are conflicts in the testimony of the different witnesses, you must reconcile them if you can.

In forming your opinion as to the credibility of a witness, you may look to the proof, if any, of his or her general character, the evidence, if any, of the witness' reputation for truth and veracity, the intelligence and respectability of the witness, his or her interest or lack of interest and the outcome of the trial, his or her feelings, his or her apparent fairness or bias, his or her means of knowledge, the reasonableness of his or her statements and their appearance and demeanor while testifying.

There have been some things testified to that have been in conflict. And you'll have to go back and ask yourself why that is. When you do, ask yourself of all the people you heard from, who would have the biggest reason to lie to you?

Who would have the biggest reason to try to sell yet another story about what happened November 5th, 2004?

Let's talk about Dr. Carter. You heard her tell you that she was familiar with erotic asphyxia. She was familiar with those types of cases. She performed autopsies on many of them. She'd been to scenes where she had seen them. Was this a case of erotic asphyxia, Dr. Carter? No. Why do you say that? Because of the injuries, because of what was not found at the scene.

All of that stuff that Vern Braswell enjoyed so much explaining to y'all yesterday, go through those crime scene pictures and tell me where you see any of it. Go through this crime scene sketch and tell me where the officers found any of it. They didn't. He brought it in here. Who knows where it came from. He tells you it comes from their house, but who has a reason to make that up?

Dr. Carter told you that this was hands on a neck. And she made the distinction because Mr. Bailey tried to get her to go down this road that it could have been a forearm. No, it couldn't have, Mr. Bailey. No, sorry, Mr. Defendant, it couldn't have been because of the extent of the injury and the coverage of the injury. This was not an injury that was located in the front part of the neck. This was not an injury where there was anything broken or fractured. This was an injury consistent with pressure being applied all over the

neck with two hands. Like a choking? Yeah. Like when you mean to kill somebody.

There was petechiae, the rupturing of the blood vessels all over the face, the hemorrhaging. Go back through your notes and review what she told us about what she found.

And then contrast that, if you will, with Mark Schwartz from St. Louis, Missouri, drove in for \$3000 yesterday. Found by the defense team on Saturday. Came down here to tell you that after reviewing the extensive file that he was sent, you know, he never bothered to call us. Never bothered to call the police. Never bothered to talk to any witnesses. Who did he talk to? The guy in control. The guy that's calling the shots. He looked at five pictures, five, of Sheila Braswell's body, the way it was positioned on the floor. Did you catch that?

The EMTs put her on the floor. If he'd stayed another day and we'd paid him another \$3000, was he going to tell us that the EMTs performed erotic asphyxia on her? What's he talking about? How relevant is that, that the position where the paramedics put her lifeless body, trying to do what they could, that that was relevant? No. Or is he maybe just saying what Mr. Power Man over there wanted him to say for \$3000?

He's not a medical doctor. He's a doctor of science. He didn't dispute what Dr. Carter found. I was waiting for

them to call in some medical examiner to come in and say this wasn't a manual strangulation. This was a drowning and here's why. No. He'll say whatever they want him to say for \$3000. And all he had to look at was what they had given him. And the only person he bothered to talk to was the guy that's got the biggest motive to lie.

Contrast his testimony with Dr. Carter. Look at the pictures of the injury, the extent of the injury to Sheila Braswell's body. Ask yourself a few more questions when y'all are back in that jury room.

Why was he so worried about that nipple ring? You remember Sheronda Smith telling you that he had just -- here's a man whose wife has just died some, as far as he knows, unexplained death. The last time he saw her she was unconscious in the bathtub, according to his story. How much sense does that make, you're going to leave your unconscious wife in the bathtub full of water? The next thing he knows she's dead. The police come to his house, drag him down here to 201 Poplar to talk to him. He gets home hours later. He's apparently still not told his kids your wife -- your mother's dead.

But what's he worried about? I seem to have lost my nipple ring. I can't find my nipple ring. His own mother said what? What are you worried about? His nipple ring.

Because see, by now it's the light of day. By now the police

2.0

have been called. They've talked to him. He's given this statement that you can take back and read that you heard Sergeant Merritt read to you. He's locked into something, but he's panicking because he's thinking you know what, this may not all go off as well as I planned. I may have got caught in a little lie here. I've got to find that nipple ring because if they find that nipple ring, they might think -- they might realize that Sheila was fighting for her life. Sheila was struggling the only way she could to have one more day with her two boys.

Sheila was using the only weapon she could, just grabbing at him with her hands. And if they find that nipple ring, they might realize I killed her. If they find Kristie Woods, they might find out I had a reason to kill her. If they find out that Sheila had filed for divorce, they might think that maybe our marriage wasn't so great.

And then the big bomb was dropped. We found out about all the other incidents, all the other times he's put his hands on her neck, put his hands on Kristie Woods' neck.

Mr. Bailey made a big point in opening statement and just a moment ago that Kristie Woods and this defendant engaged in erotic asphyxia. That's not what I heard her say at all. In fact, I asked her, Ms. Woods, when I asked you down in my office what -- if you two engaged in erotic asphyxia, her answer to me was what is that. She didn't know

what it was, had never heard of it. When she testified in front of you and we discussed it she said no, no, no, no, we didn't do that. He would just sometimes hold me to position me to keep me still. Was it forceful? No. Did you ever lose consciousness? No. Did you ever get dizzy? No. Was it different when y'all were having sex and he would hold your neck and the time when he grabbed your neck and he pushed it against the coffee table? Yeah. They never engaged in it.

And if Sheila Braswell, God love her, could walk in that back door right now and tell us the rest of the story, what do you want to bet she'd say I never heard of it either? What do you want to bet she'd say I don't know what he's talking about? We were fighting because I was tired of him carousing around with Kristie Woods. We were fighting because he found the check that I wrote out the last week of October to the divorce attorney, the divorce complaint that wasn't nonsuited until five days after her death. It's kind of hard to proceed with a divorce case when you're dead. That's why it was dismissed, ladies and gentlemen. Look at the date on it. We were fighting about that, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

But see, I forgot the number one rule. I forgot that

Vern Braswell is in control. He calls the shots. And he came

out with those hands that he's come at you with before and he

squeezed my neck before but it wasn't anything like that. It

was longer and harder this time. He didn't let go. The times before he always let go and I was always able to get away and go live with my sweet sister-in-law and brother-in-law or go live with my dear friend Magra Harden, or I was able to go down to Judge Robilio's chambers and get an order of protection. This time I wasn't so lucky. This time I died at the hands of my husband who held my neck while I struggled until my body had physically reached the point where I could no longer struggle.

And a few times he held my head under the water. How do we know that? Dr. Carter told you there were signs of water fluid in the lungs, not enough to rule this a drowning but enough for her to tell you, Dr. Carter, could this have been a situation where while she was being choked her head was held under water to gain control over? Oh, yes, ma'am, definitely. Is it a drowning? No.

Troy Walls, the officer from the Millington Police

Department, told you something that I want you to be sure to remember when you go back and you read through the facts as Sheila Braswell, you know, it's ironic these are the only words she can speak to us. This is all we know about her side of their marriage. Why'd she stay with him? I don't know.

What a great day it would be in this city and all the others if prosecutors didn't have to deal with women who were abused and continued to stay with their spouses, if

prosecutors didn't have to look at women and say, you know, you can make this all better by leaving, getting your number changed, moving to another town, whatever, go into a shelter, whatever you need to do. What a great day it would be if the Sheila Braswell's of this city would come to us first looking like that instead of when we usually meet them like that.

MR. W. BAILEY: Your Honor, may we approach?
THE COURT: You may.

(Bench conference commenced.)

MR. W. BAILEY: Counsel is arguing outside the record in terms of how they usually meet.

THE COURT: Okay. Move on with regard to the encounter of abused women in the prosecutor's office. We'll move on from that.

(Said bench conference concluded.)

MS. WEIRICH: That's the last picture you have of her. But we know that on this day, when according to Sheila Braswell, now remember the defendant told you they were fighting because she was having an affair. Remember that? Sheila writes in here though and you can take this back and look at it, we had a dispute over drinking and drugs. His drinking and his drugs. He had slapped me in the face, pulled my hair, threw me up against the wall and chair. Sound familiar, doesn't it? Did that to Kristie Woods just last year. Choked me from behind, cutting off my air supply, told

me to say my prayers. Think she got a chance to say her prayers in those three to seven minutes?

I tried to leave. He restrained me because nobody leaves Vern Braswell. Nobody tells him what to do. He tried to punch me. He ripped my jewelry off, and he said that he would be paid alimony when we got divorced.

She was able to leave the house and call 911. And Officer Walls who was a young officer, a new officer riding with Officer Nicholson that night. Even though he didn't remember this incident like it had happened yesterday and he was very honest with you about that, he did remember it. He said there were a few of those incidents, a few of those calls he made early on in his career that still stick with him and this was one of them.

The defendant had already left the scene by the time they got there. Fred Jackson told you he was the fire department lieutenant first to get there that drew the sketch that you have in evidence that shows you how the body was when he had halfway pulled her out to show that he had done something, but for some reason couldn't get all 120 pounds of her out of that tub. Lieutenant Jackson told you that when he walked in that bathroom the air was still moist. Remember that? The bathroom was still wet like somebody had just run water.

Yeah, Mr. Power Man over there had just turned the

water on again, made it look like a drowning. But then when the medical examiner didn't cooperate with that, she ruled it a strangulation, he had to think of something else. But why would Lieutenant Jackson remember that?

Myron Fair with OCU testified, he had a suit and tie on, testified that he got a call from the defendant. Mr. Bailey said wasn't he crying and distraught and incoherent when you talked to him? No, I don't remember that. He was just calling, telling me his wife was dead. 18 calls he placed to a Lieutenant John Mitchell, Memphis Police Department, his big buddy. Even Lieutenant Mitchell told you he didn't know why he was calling him.

Pearline Washburn, she was the first witness you heard from, Sheila Braswell's mother. Been here everyday. Remember something that she told you that was important. At the time we didn't know it was important. She told you that when she sat on the couch next to the defendant and touched his robe, his robe was wet. Why was his robe wet if according to his story yesterday he didn't put it on until the paramedics were at his door? Did you hear him? He grabbed it at the end of the bed when he was on his way to answer the door when he thought he heard the paramedics. How did it get wet? Was there a flood in the hallway? No, it got wet when he was struggling, trying to kill his wife as she was resisting, trying to fight for her life. That's when it got wet.

1.8

That's also, ladies and gentlemen, why there is no sign of a struggle in the bedroom. There wasn't a struggle in the bedroom. There was a struggle in the bathtub. That's the crime scene, ladies and gentlemen, where the jewelry was, where the hair was, where the hot water was, where the body that had already undergone rigor mortis was.

This isn't about people's lifestyles and who you like and who you don't like. This is about seeking truth and justice. That's why it's all laid out for you here. That's why you're called here to make that determination, to make that decision. Before you leave the courtroom, Judge Dailey will send you off with the words "to return a verdict that truth dictates and justice demands." And it's because of those words that we talk so much in voir dire about the law, the evidence and the common sense. No sympathy, no prejudice.

We don't want you to just look at five pictures like
Mike Schwartz did. We don't want you to just listen to what
the defendant told you yesterday, which was completely
contrary to what he told the police and everybody else who
would listen. It's why the police department continues to
investigate after they take a statement like that. It's why
the medical examiner's office does their job. Everyone that
has testified has had a little bit to tell you. It is now
your job to take it all.

And in following the laws of the State of Tennessee

that Judge Dailey will read to you, to return the only verdict that you can after you take everything and turn it inside out and review it.

And when you go back there to do that, ask yourself another question. Why did he tell the police that he didn't ejaculate? After this night of love making, why did he say no to that question? Do you think maybe that's why he so willingly submitted to the DNA because he knew they could find his DNA in her if he had? They hadn't had sex. She was in the tub, the tub that soon became her coffin.

The only verdict you can return is that of guilty of murder in the first degree.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the State of Tennessee versus Vern Braswell, Indictment Number 05-03038.

This indictment charges that the defendant did unlawfully, intentionally and with premeditation kill Sheila Braswell. This offense embraces and includes the lesser offenses of murder in the second degree, voluntary manslaughter, reckless homicide and criminally negligent homicide.

The law makes it the duty of the Court to give in charge to the jury the law relative to the case on trial and the duty of the jury to carefully consider all of the evidence delivered to them on the trial and under the law given them by the Court, render their verdict with absolute impartiality.

2.0

The jury are the sole judges of the facts and of the law as it applies to the facts in the case. In making up your verdict, you are to consider the law in connection with the facts; but the Court is the proper source from which you are to get the law. In other words, you are the judges of the law as well as the facts under my direction. The jury in no case should have any sympathy or prejudice or allow anything but the law and the evidence to have any influence upon them in determining their verdict. They should render their verdict with absolute fairness and impartiality as they think truth and justice dictate. Every fact and circumstance in the case you may consider in arriving at your verdict.

The indictment in this case is the formal written accusation charging the defendant with a crime. It is not evidence against him and does not create any inference of guilt.

At times during the trial, I have ruled upon the admissibility of evidence. You must not concern yourselves with these rulings. Neither by such rulings, these instructions, nor any other remarks which I have made do I mean to indicate any opinion as to the facts or as to what your verdict should be.

Statements, arguments, and remarks of counsel are intended to help you in understanding the evidence and applying the law, but they are not evidence. If any

statements were made that you believe are not supported by the evidence, you should disregard them.

I instruct you that the words used in these instructions importing a masculine gender include the feminine and neuter.

The evidence and arguments in this case have been completed, and it is my duty now to instruct you as to the law. The law applicable to this case is stated in these instructions, and it is your duty to carefully consider all of them. The order in which these instructions are given is not an indication of their relative importance. You should not single out one or more of them to the exclusion of another or others but should consider each one in the light of and in harmony with the others.

You are the exclusive judges of the facts in this case. You are also the exclusive judges of the law under my direction. You should apply the law to the facts in deciding this case. You should consider all of the evidence in the light of your own observations and experience in life.

I will now explain to you the law applicable to the charge in this indictment.

First degree murder. For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must have proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the following essential elements: That the defendant unlawfully killed the alleged

victim; and that the defendant acted intentionally.

A person acts intentionally when it is the person's conscious objective or desire to cause the death of the alleged victim. A defendant's conscious objective need not be to kill a specific victim. If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to cause the result, the death of a person, and that he did so with premeditation, then the killing of another even if not the intended victim would be first degree murder. And that the defendant -- that the killing was premeditated.

A premeditated act is one done after the exercise of reflection and judgment. Premeditation means that the intent to kill must have been formed prior to the act itself. It is not necessary that the purpose to kill preexist in the mind of the accused for any definite period of time. The mental state of the accused at the time he allegedly decided to kill must be carefully considered in order to determine whether the accused was sufficiently free from excitement and passion as to be capable of premeditation. If the design to kill was formed with premeditation, it is immaterial that the accused may have been in a state of passion or excitement when the design was carried into effect. Furthermore, premeditation can be found if the decision to kill is first formed during the heat of passion, but the accused commits the act after the passion has subsided.

If you find from the proof beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant is guilty of murder in the first degree, you will so report and your verdict in that event shall be we, the jury, find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree.

Second degree murder. For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must have proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the following essential elements: That the defendant unlawfully killed the alleged victim; and that the defendant acted knowingly.

Voluntary manslaughter. For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must have proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the following elements:

That the defendant unlawfully killed the alleged victim; and that the defendant acted intentionally or knowingly; and that the killing resulted from a state of passion produced by adequate provocation sufficient to lead a reasonable person to act in an irrational manner.

The distinction between voluntary manslaughter and second degree murder is that voluntary manslaughter requires that the killing result from a state of passion produced by adequate provocation sufficient to lead a reasonable person to act in an irrational manner.

Reckless homicide. For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must have proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the following essential

elements: That the defendant killed the alleged victim; and that the defendant acted recklessly.

Criminally negligent homicide. For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must have proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the following essential elements: That the defendant's conduct resulted in the death of the alleged victim; and that the defendant acted with criminal negligence.

Criminal negligence means that a person acts with criminal negligence when that person ought to be aware of a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the victim will be killed. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that the failure to perceive it constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of care that an ordinary person would exercise under all the circumstances as viewed from the accused person's standpoint.

The requirement of criminal negligence is also established if it is shown that the defendant acted intentionally, knowingly or recklessly.

Intentionally means that a person acts intentionally when it is the person's conscious objective or desire to cause the death of the victim.

Knowingly means that a person acts with an awareness that his conduct is reasonably certain to cause the death of the victim.

The requirement of knowingly is also established if it is shown that the defendant acted intentionally.

Recklessly means that a person acts recklessly when the person is aware of but consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the alleged victim would be killed. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that its disregard constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of care that an ordinary person would exercise under all the circumstances as viewed from the accused person's standpoint.

The guilt of the defendant as well as any fact required to be proved may be established by direct evidence, circumstantial evidence, or by both combined.

Direct evidence is defined as evidence which proves the existence of the fact in issue without inference or presumption. Direct evidence may consist of testimony of a person who has perceived by the means of his or her senses the existence of a fact sought to be proved or disproved.

Circumstantial evidence consists of proof of collateral facts and circumstances which do not directly prove the fact in issue but from which that fact may be logically inferred.

When the evidence is made up entirely of circumstantial evidence, then before you would be justified in finding the defendant guilty, you must find that all the essential facts are consistent with the hypothesis of guilt, as that is to be compared with all the facts proved; they must exclude every

other reasonable theory or hypothesis except that of guilt; and they must establish such a certainty of guilt of the defendant as to convince the mind beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is the one who committed the offense. It is not necessary that each particular fact be proved beyond a reasonable doubt if enough are proved to satisfy the jury beyond a reasonable doubt of all the facts necessary to constitute the crime charged. Before a verdict of guilty is justified, the circumstances, taken together, must be of a conclusive nature and tendency, leading on the whole to a satisfactory conclusion that the defendant and no one else committed the offense.

You enter upon this investigation with the presumption that the defendant is not guilty of any crime and this stands as a witness for him until it is rebutted and overturned by competent and credible proof. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the State before you can convict the defendant, to establish to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime charged in the indictment has been committed; that the same was committed within the County of Shelby and State of Tennessee before the finding of this indictment and that the defendant at the bar committed the crime in such manner that would make him guilty under the law heretofore defined and explained to you.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and

common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all of the evidence in the case.

It is not necessary that the defendant's guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt, as absolute certainty of guilt is not demanded by the law to convict of any criminal charge.

A reasonable doubt is just that, a doubt that is reasonable after an examination of all the facts of the case.

If you find the State has not proven every element beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty.

There are several modes of impeaching a witness. One mode is to prove that a witness has at different times made conflicting statements as to material facts of the case as to which he testifies. Still another mode is by rigid and close cross-examination to involve the witness in contradictions and discrepancies as to the material facts stated by him.

Immaterial discrepancies or differences in the statements do not affect their credibility unless there is something to show that they originated in a willful falsehood and you, members of the jury, are to determine how far the testimony of any impeached witness has been impaired by any invalidating process.

You will take all of the evidence adduced in the case by the State and the defendant and give it a full, fair and

impartial consideration. If there are any conflicts in the statements of the different witnesses, it is your duty to reconcile them if you can, for the law presumes that every witness has sworn to the truth but if you cannot, the law makes you the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight to be given their testimony.

In forming your opinion as to the credibility of a witness, you may look to the proof, if any, of his general character, the manner and demeanor of the witness, the consistency or inconsistency of his statements, their probability or improbability, his ability and willingness to speak the truth, his intelligence and means of knowledge, his motive to speak the truth or swear to a falsehood, his interest or lack of interest in the outcome of the trial.

When the defendant makes himself a witness in his own behalf, his credibility is to be determined by the same rules by which the credibility of others is determined, and you will give to the defendant's testimony in this case such weight as you may think it entitled to.

You have heard testimony about the defendant's good character. You should consider this testimony, along with all the other evidence, in deciding if there is a reasonable doubt as to the defendant's quilt.

Evidence has been introduced in this case regarding certain prior acts of misconduct and/or crimes allegedly

committed by the defendant, Vern Braswell. It is up to you, the jury, to decide whether or not you choose to rely on this proof and if so, what weight you choose to give it.

If you do accredit this proof, it can only be used to determine the specific issues of identity, intent or rebuttal of accident or mistake. This evidence should not be used as propensity evidence. As always, the State has the burden of proving every element of the offense charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

The rules of evidence provide that if scientific, technical or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by reason of special knowledge, skill or experience may testify and state his or her opinions concerning such matters and give reasons for his or her testimony.

Merely because an expert witness has expressed an opinion does not mean, however, that you are bound to accept this opinion. The same as with any other witness, it is up to you to decide whether you believe this testimony and choose to rely upon it. Part of that decision will depend on your judgment about whether the witness's background and training and experience is sufficient for the witness to give the expert opinion that you heard. You must also decide whether the witness's opinions were based on sound reasons, judgment

and information.

You are to give the testimony of an expert witness such weight and value as you think it deserves along with all of the other evidence in the case.

Members of the jury, you have been allowed to take notes in this case. I charge you that these notes are for your individual use only, and you should not use notes directly or indirectly, explicitly or implicitly to persuade other jurors as to the accuracy of said notes. They should not be shown to others, nor compared, nor referred to in any way as authority, but should be used privately only by the maker of said notes as an aid to his or her individual memory.

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. Your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty, as jurors, to consult with one another and deliberate with a view toward reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence solely

because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

When you retire to consider your verdict in the indictment, you will first inquire, is the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree as charged in the indictment. If you find the defendant guilty of this offense beyond a reasonable doubt, your verdict should be, "We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree as charged in the indictment."

If you find the defendant not guilty of this offense or have a reasonable doubt of his guilt of this offense, you will acquit him thereof and then proceed to inquire whether or not he is guilty of murder in the second degree as included in the indictment.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of this offense, your verdict should be, "We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of murder in the second degree as included in the indictment."

If you find the defendant not guilty of this offense or have a reasonable doubt of his guilt of this offense, you will acquit him thereof and then proceed to inquire whether or not he is guilty of voluntary manslaughter as included in the indictment.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is quilty of this offense, your verdict should be,

"We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of voluntary manslaughter as included in the indictment."

If you find the defendant not guilty of this offense or have a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt of this offense, you will acquit him thereof and then proceed to inquire whether or not he is guilty of reckless homicide as included in the indictment.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of this offense, your verdict should be, "We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of reckless homicide as included in the indictment."

If you find the defendant not guilty of this offense or have a reasonable doubt of his guilt of this offense, you will acquit him thereof and then proceed to inquire whether or not he is guilty of criminally negligent homicide as included in the indictment.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of this offense, your verdict should be, "We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of criminally negligent homicide as included in the indictment."

If you do find the defendant guilty, you can convict him of only one of the above named offenses charged and included in this indictment.

If upon all the proof, you have a reasonable doubt of his guilt of the offenses charged and included in the

indictment under the law defined and explained to you, it is your duty to acquit him and your verdict should be, "We, the jury, find the defendant not guilty in the indictment."

You will write your verdict as to the indictment on the outside of the jacket and sign one of your names as foreman or foreperson.

Take the case, consider all of the facts and circumstances fairly and impartially and report to the -- and report such verdict to the Court -- and report to the Court such verdict as truth dictates and justice demands.

Anything further, Mr. Bailey? Ms. Weirich?

MS. WEIRICH: No, Your Honor.

MR. J. BAILEY: Nothing from the defense, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you will have the charge back in the jury room with you. Feel free to reread any or all of it. When you have reached your verdict in this case, whatever your verdict may be, I would refer you to the last several pages of the charge and ask you to follow the appropriate verdict form that can be found on those last several pages in writing up your verdict.

Please, write your verdict on the outside of the jacket, date it, sign one of your names as foreman or foreperson. You'll have most of the exhibits back in the jury room with you for your review as well. If there are any that

aren't passed back there that you want to view, let us know and you can certainly view them in the courtroom.

And at this time I think given the time, we'll stop for lunch. Once you've completed lunch, then you may begin your deliberations. There won't be any need to come back into the courtroom. But do not discuss the case during the lunch hour even though we've gotten to this point in the trial. During lunch you are not to discuss the case at all. It wouldn't be right for two or three of you to be down at one end of the table talking about the case.

Only after you've completed lunch and you've been handed the jacket and the charge and the exhibits by Officer Lafferty, only then may you begin your deliberations. And at this time I will excuse Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Wade. If the rest of y'all would retire to the jury room at this time.

(At 11:59 a.m., the jury retired from the courtroom to begin deliberations upon its verdict.)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wade and
Mr. Gillespie, I want to thank both of you for serving as
alternates in this case. I'm sure you understand how
important it is that we have alternates available if in the
event we needed you. At this time you are excused, and the
bailiffs will assist you in getting back to the hotel and

getting your belongings and making sure you have a ride home. Thanks very much. And I don't plan to bring the jurors back in after lunch so y'all don't need to be back here at 1 or 1:30 but leave your phone numbers where we can reach you certainly. Stand in recess.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: The jury has a question, two questions actually, that need to be answered. All right. Bring in the jury, please.

(At 3:29 p.m., the jury returned to the courtroom and the following proceedings were had to wit:)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I've received two questions that were submitted to me. The first reads as follows: Should we consider -- should we consider every witness's testimony as evidence?

As I read to you earlier in the charge, you will take all of the evidence adduced in the case by the State and the Defendant and give it a full, fair, and impartial consideration. If there are any conflicts in the statements of the different witnesses, it is your duty to reconcile them if you can for the law presumes that every witness has sworn to the truth. But if you cannot, the law makes you the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility of the witnesses and

the weight to be given their testimony.

In forming your opinion as to the credibility of a witness, you may look to the proof, if any, of his general character, the manner and demeanor of the witness, the consistency or inconsistency of his statements, their probability or improbability, his ability and willingness to speak the truth, his intelligence and means of knowledge, his motive to speak the truth or swear to a falsehood, his interest or lack of interest in the outcome of the trial.

When the defendant makes himself a witness in his own behalf, his credibility is to be determined by the same rules by which the credibility of others is determined and you will give to the defendant's testimony in this case such weight as you may think it entitled to.

There was also some mention made of a question about transcripts of certain witness's testimony. There are no transcripts in the trial. You must rely on your memory, individually and collectively, your memory of the testimony during the trial, but there are no transcripts made simultaneous to the testimony to be passed back to the jury during their deliberations.

And then the final question is a factual question and I can only state that I am not allowed to make any comment on the facts of the case. It's up to you jurors to recall again individually and collectively what the facts of the case are

2

3

4

and were and reach your verdict based on the proof that came into evidence this week from the witness stand and the physical proof and the law that I've presented to you. But I cannot answer any questions that relate to factual issues of the case. 5 Having said that, I'll ask you to return to the jury 6 room to resume the deliberations. 7 8 (At 3:33, p.m., the jury retired from the courtroom to resume 9 deliberations upon its verdict.) 10 11 MR. J. BAILEY: May we approach? 12 THE COURT: You may. 13 (Bench conference commenced.) 14 MR. J. BAILEY: Are we entitled to know what the 15 fact question is? 16 THE COURT: Oh, sure. I just didn't see any need 17 to read it out. 18 MR. J. BAILEY: Yeah, that's why I asked to 19 20 approach. THE COURT: When performing the erotic 21 asphyxiation was penetration to Sheila performed? 22 MR. J. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. I think that is 23 a fact question. I just wanted to know, Your Honor. 24 (Said bench conference concluded.) 25

```
THE COURT: Take him out. Stand in recess.
1
2
                  (Recess.)
                  THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please.
                                                          The jury
3
      has asked for a few more minutes to continue their
4
      deliberations. Take him out, please. Stand in recess.
5
                  (Recess.)
6
                  THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please. All right.
7
      Let's take him out. Stand in recess.
8
                  (Recess.)
9
                  THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please.
10
11
       (At 10:02 p.m., the jury returned to the courtroom and the
12
                 following proceedings were had to wit:)
13
14
15
                  THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, have
16
      you reached your verdict at this time?
                  FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
17
18
                  THE COURT: May I see the jacket, please.
             All right. In Indictment 05-03038 your verdict reads
19
      as follows: We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of murder
20
21
      in the second degree as included in the indictment. Signed
22
      Mary Brooks, 12/9/05.
23
      (The jury was polled and no negative responses were elicited.)
                  THE COURT: All right. I want to thank all of you
24
      for serving on this jury. As the attorneys have already
25
```

mentioned, we appreciate and understand the sacrifice and inconvenience that's involved in serving on a sequestered jury of this sort. It's not an easy task, and it takes you away from your families for an entire week. But our system would not work -- in my opinion it works better than any system in the world -- and it would not work like it does without citizens from the community agreeing to serve on juries and listen to cases and reach verdicts. So we all genuinely appreciate your service this week on this jury.

At this time you are excused. Of course the bailiffs will help you get back to the hotel and make sure you have your belongings and have a ride home. Thank you very much.

(Jury out.)

THE COURT: All right. Stand up, Mr. Braswell.

Mr. Braswell, after a fair and impartial trial by a jury of
your peers, said jury having found you guilty in Cause Number
05-03038 of the included offense of murder in the second
degree, I hereby find you guilty of that offense. The
sentencing hearing will be scheduled for the 17th of January.
Of course all bond if there is any at any point in time is
revoked. January 17th for sentencing.

MR. W. BAILEY: Your Honor, can we pick another date other than the 17th? I've got a trial starting in Federal Court on that day.

THE COURT: The 20th? January 20th? Will you be

through by then? MR. W. BAILEY: That trial probably is going to run somewhere between -- maybe a two-week trial. THE COURT: Okay. Let's set it on the -- why don't we set it on the 6th, January 6th? Can you be here that date? MR. W. BAILEY: That would be fine. MR. J. BAILEY: And of course we will just for the record --THE COURT: Get a date for motion for new trial at that time. January 6th. Step out, sir. THIS WAS ALL THE EVIDENCE INTRODUCED AND PROCEEDINGS HAD RELEVANT TO QUESTIONS RAISED ON APPEAL ON THE TRIAL OF THIS CAUSE.

4	
1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	
3	STATE OF TENNESSEE)
4).
5	COUNTY OF SHELBY)
6	
7	I, the undersigned, Katherine Knowles, Court
8	Reporter for the Thirtieth Judicial District of the State of
9	Tennessee, do hereby certify that the foregoing to be true,
10	accurate and complete transcript to the best of my knowledge,
11	understanding and ability of all the evidence that was heard
12	in this cause in Division 5 of the Criminal Court for Shelby
13	County, Tennessee, before the Honorable Joseph B. Dailey,
14	Presiding Judge, on the 5th day of December, 2005.
15	I do further certify that I am neither of kin,
16	counsel nor interest to any party hereto.
17	Dated this 10th day of April, 2006.
18	
19	0, 0,
20	J. Y.
21	Jatherene flowers
22	Katherine Khowles Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	

IN THE CRIMINAL COURTS FOR THE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT MEMPHIS DIVISION $\underline{\text{FIVE}}$

STATE OF TENNESSEE APPELLEE

VS.

VERN BRASWELL APPELLANT Docket No. 05-03038

FILED: 0 (p (

BY: (C C) D.C

APPELLANT'S FILING OF TRANSCRIPT AND NOTICE OF FILING TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Pursuant to Rule 24(b), Tennessee Rules of Appellate Procedure, this is to notify that the Petitioner/appellant has filed the transcript with the Clerk of the Criminal Court of Shelby County, Tennessee.

This 16TH of AUGUST, 2006.

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLANT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF NOTICE TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY GENERAL

I certify that I have delivered a copy of this Certification and Filing of Transcript to the office of the District Attorney General on this 16TH day of AUGUST, 2006.

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLANT

IN THE CRIMINAL COURTS FOR THE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT MEMPHIS DIVISION NINE

STATE OF TENNESSEE APPELLEE

VS.

Docket No. 05-03038

FILED: <u>/0-//-06</u> WILLIAM R-KEY, CLERK

VERN BRASWELL APPELLANT 11.1

ORDER APPROVING TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE AND MAKING THE TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE PART OF THE RECORD ON APPEAL

This is to certify that the Transcript of Evidence adduced at the Trial of this cause has been filed with the Clerk on AUGUST 16, 2006 in accordance with Tennessee Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 24, Section (b) within ninety (90) days after filing the Notice of Appeal, which was filed on MAY 22,2006 and has been examined by counsel for the defendant and the Assistant Attorney General and has been found by both to be a true and accurate record of the proceedings in this cause and has been approved by both counsel.

This is to further certify that the Court has examined the Transcript of Evidence of the Trial in this cause and has found it to be a true and accurate record of the proceedings. The Court therefore certifies that the Transcript of Evidence reflects truly & accurately the trial of this cause.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Transcript of Evidence is hereby approved by the Court and counsel for the defendant and the State of Tennessee, and the Clerk is hereby ordered to make the Transcript of Evidence part of the record on appeal in this cause.

ENTERED, this the // day of /

APPROVED:

JUDGE

ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

ATTORNEY FOR THE DEFENDANT/APPELLANT

STATE OF TENNESSEE) SHELBY COUNTY)

I, William R. Key, Clerk of the Criminal Court of the 30th Judicial Circuit at Memphis, do herby certify that the forgoing **3711** pages of writing contain a full, complete, true and perfect copy of the **TRANSCRIPT OF THE RECORD** in the case of:

STATE OF TENNESSEE

vs.

Docket No **05-03038**

VERN BRASWELL

FIRST DEGREE MURDER; as the same appears on file, and of record in my office, and that I am the Custodian of said records and that all **entries** are presently under my care, custody and control.

WITNESS my hand and the seal of said Court, at office in Memphis, this **26**TH day of **OCTOBER 2006**.

WILLIAM R. KEY, Clerk

By: Claras D.C.

SEAL